

Valley Center Community Planning Group

Minutes for the June 28, 2010 Regular Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Ann Quinley Secretary: Deborah Hofler

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Absent Ab=Abstain A/I=Agenda Item BOS=Board of Supervisors DPLU=Department of Planning and Land Use IAW=In Accordance
With N=Nay P=Present SC=Subcommittee TBD=To Be Determined VCCPG=Valley Center Community Planning Group Y=Yea

Forwarded to Members: June 29,2010

Approved: July 12, 2010

1.		Call to Order and Roll Call by Seat #:									07:00			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P		P	P	P

Notes:

Quorum Established: 12

Yes (X)

2.	Pledge of Allegiance
3.	Approval of Minutes:

Motion: The PG approves the June 14, 2010 minutes as disseminated.

Maker/Second: Rudolf/Montross

Carries (Y-N-A): 11 - 0 – 1 (Bachman)

Notes:

4.	Open Forum:
a)	Larry Glavinic: The Planning Commission had a workshop on June 18, 2010 about transfer of development rights (TDR). The first draft was balanced, the upzone would have to pay for ½ of the upzone. The second draft, the upzone is free and the downzone will have to wait for a general plan amendment to get compensation.
b)	Robert Austin: Concerned about a cell phone tower going in close to where he lives. They are dangerous to your health over the long term. The towers produce radiation. It is dangerous up to 400 meters. They also lower property values.
c)	Scott Geinzer: Landscaped medians on V.C road in the South Village. He is against it. It would make it difficult for big trucks to turn into Terry's Hay and Grain. This would financially hurt the businesses in the South Village.
5.	Announcements & Items of Public Interest:
a)	Rich Rudolf – The contractors have started work to put in the pipes and landscape the medians and the Heritage Trail. They have 90 days to do this. Then they are responsible for the plants for the next 270 days. They have to maintain the areas for 3 years.
6.	Land Use Items:
6.a.	VAC 2009-0052-A. Presentation, discussion and possible vote on the Miller Road Vacation.

Discussion & Comments: The Department of General Services, Real Estate Services Division is processing a road vacation at the request of the Department of Public Works in conjunction with the Valley Center Road (north) Reconstruction project which necessitated the realignment of Miller Road. The objective of the vacation is to clear title and to eliminate public rights and liability for the former road right of way. Reviewed by Tom Herrington of Dept. of General Services.

Rudolf – It would have been a great area for staging for the Heritage Trail.

Wynn – Is the land being given or sold? It is being given since it was an easement only. There is no sale.

Motion: To approve the vacation of the road easement.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
--------------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------	---	-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	---------------------------------

A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	^N Y	Y
Maker/Second: Smith/Christianson								Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12-0-0						
Notes:														
6.b.		GP Update Subcommittee:												
Discussion & Comments: Update and possible vote by on landowner issues received regarding zoning endorsed by DPLU and the Planning Commission, Vote to approve receipts for handout copies made for presentation to Realtors group (Rudolf). This zoning is to be consistent to the land use on the GPU and Community Plan. An example is: Bates Nut Farm is shown to be A70 in the front and Commercial in the back where the existing commercial is. Another major issue is the industrially zoned lots in the Moosa Creek Flood Plane that are being changed to rural residential. Ann Howard: My property has been changed from one acre minimum to 2 acre minimum. Why was I not notified? Rudolf: They send the notices to street addresses. Or you are not affected or they messed up. Jim Badouh: my property has the same issue. James Chagala: The Weston property is zoned C34 in the staff recommendation. Everyone around him is zoned C36. The reason it is zoned C34 is from the 1990's. There was question as to whether is would be developed commercially or residentially. C34 was a good fit at that time. We now have a concrete plan. We would like it rezoned to C36. C36 allows a few more uses and allows residential use secondary to commercial. Davis: Of the different uses that are allowed, which are you preparing to pursue: Automotive repair and maintenance. Tom Baumgarder: Gasoline station? They are allowed in C34 and C36. Rudolf: This is not a change that the County wanted to us to look at. Would be more comfortable if the Northern Village and the GPU SC had looked at this first. We noted know what the adjacent property owners think about it. Why is this an issue if you have a specific plan that would over ride all of the underlying zoning? Chagala – We are trying to get rid of any stigma that would arise from the inconsistent zoning. Bachman: This seems like a 12 th hour street play. Chagala: We did not get notification and it was overlooked. Rudolf: Spent many years listening to developers lie. Is very cynical. Vick: Uncomfortable that don't know all of the facts and that this has not been reviewed by the SC's. Ken Lounsbery – Represents three property owners, Todd Johnston, Laura Brown, Don Cowen. They are responding to the notification of the zone change. They are all in the Moosa Creek flood plane. They are going to protest the existing zone changes. These properties are intensely utilized. By down zoning them, you have removed any incentive to upgrade the property. A legal, nonconforming use is a very tricky position to be in. Hofler: Does an industrial overlay on the SR2 allow the current use without changing the business? Rudolf: The county will not do a zoning overlay of industrial over residential. Davis: The fact that they had a designation and they were not given an opportunity to solve the problem is an issue. Hofler: The County Has been working with my property to do a zoning overlay that is not on the current map. This is very disturbing that the county has not followed through with 10 years of work.														
Motion 1: Approve the staff-proposed list of Zoning Recommendations to be consistent with the Revised GPU Land Use Map (Planning Commission Endorsed April 2010), and forward them to Devon Muto ASAP.														
A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Maker/Second: Rudolf/Davis								Carries (Y-N-A): 11-1-0						
Notes:														
Motion 2: Change the Weston property in the Northern Village from C34 to C36 to match the surrounding properties.														
A N D E R S O	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T T S	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I	B A C H M A N

N					O		S		A				A	N	
A	Y	N	N	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	N			AB	N	AB
Maker/Second: Smith/Christianson								Fails (Y-N-A): 4-6-2							
Notes: This overall feeling of the PG was that they had not had time to properly review the request.															
Motion 3: Request the County to work with the affected property owners to allow them due process to address the flood way issue to maintain the M54 zoning (with the County's help) vs. just being rezoned. These three properties are: APN189-013-15-00, APN 189-013-12-00, APN 189-013-16-00, 28335 S. Cole Grade Road.															
A	D	H	V	B	R	Q	M	L	H	S	V	R	C	B	
ANDERSON	DAVIS	HOFER	VICK	BRITTSCH	ROBERTSON	QUINLEY	MONTROSS	LEWIS	HERIGSTAD	SMITH	VACANT	RUDOLF	CHRISTIANSON	BACHMAN	
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		AB	Y	Y	
Maker/Second: Hofler/Davis								Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-1							
Notes:															
6.c.		AD09-048 (300-09-048).													
Discussion & Comments: Addition of a second dwelling unit with stables and garage on 6.18 acres. Project address: 31075 Valley Center Road at Sunset Road; Owner: Ralph and Dianne Weekly; Project contact person: Michael Mills, 1061 Evergreen Lane, Vista. (Christianson). This dwelling unit was built 15 years ago. This is just to make it legal. The house and barn were built in 1980. The garage was converted into habitable space in the 1995. The barn was converted to habitable space at the same time. Part of the garage is being converted back. There are accessory structures on the property that are also being approved.															
Motion: To recommend approval of the administrative permit of the second dwelling unit.															
A	D	H	V	B	R	Q	M	L	H	S	V	R	C	B	
ANDERSON	DAVIS	HOFER	VICK	BRITTSCH	ROBERTSON	QUINLEY	MONTROSS	LEWIS	HERIGSTAD	SMITH	VACANT	RUDOLF	CHRISTIANSON	BACHMAN	
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Maker/Second: Christianson/Hofler								Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12 - 0 - 0							
Notes:															
6.d.		3000-10-019; AD10-019,													
Discussion & Comments: 26632 Oak Trail Road, placement of a 1,200 square foot dwelling (mobile or manufactured home) on the 4.8 acre parcel for owner's daughter and her family, DPLU Planner Kevin Johnston (Davis). The property owner is adding a prefabricated home onto the property with it's own septic system. The affected neighbors are for it. Septic is already approved.															
Motion: To approve an administrative permit of a second dwelling unit.															
A	D	H	V	B	R	Q	M	L	H	S	V	R	C	B	
ANDERSON	DAVIS	HOFER	VICK	BRITTSCH	ROBERTSON	QUINLEY	MONTROSS	LEWIS	HERIGSTAD	SMITH	VACANT	RUDOLF	CHRISTIANSON	BACHMAN	
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	
Maker/Second: Davis/Vick								Carries (Y-N-A): 12-0-0							
Notes:															
6.e.		ZAP03w1; 3401-03-007-01;													
Discussion & Comments: ZAP modification of a Minor Use Permit of a cell site at 11200 Berry Road; Applicant is AT&T Mobility at 5738 Pacific Center Drive; San Diego; Owner is Marvin and Luann Trust, 3112															

Shalee Drive, Sammamish, WA 98075, DPLU Planner Dixie Switzer. (Robertson). There is already a cell tower on the property. This is just an increase in branches for more reception with additional equipment and enclosure.

Motion: to approve the application as presented with the proper storm water management and erosion control plans.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Robertson/Christianson

Carries (Y-N-A): 12-0-0

Notes:

6.g. APN 189-094-21

Discussion & Comments: Southeast corner of Valley Center Road and Woods Valley Road; review of permit to remove fill from the property and grade it. Review of the grading permit. (Vick). Gary Wynn made a presentation. In the 1980's the owner allowed the County to dump dirt fill onto the lot. This permit will allow removal of the dirt to approved sites and restore the lot to it's original and natural grade. Approximately 50,000 cubic yards will be removed.

Motion: to approve the grading permit to restore the property to it's original configuration.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Vick/ Robertson

Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 12 – 0 - 0

Notes:

6.h. Circulation Subcommittee

Discussion & Comments: County Evacuation Plan Oversight Committee June 29 meeting with DPW to select a consultant: would like 2 VC representatives to be endorsed by VCCPG: Steve Hutchison and a representative from the Fire Safe Council prior to that meeting. (Davis) Andy Washburn was to help pick this representative.

Motion: to endorse Steve Hutchison and representatives from the V.C and Deer Springs Fire Safe Councils.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Davis/Vick

Carries (Y-N-A): 12-0-0

Notes:

6.i. Equine Zoning Subcommittee:

Discussion & Comments: Vote on variance requested by Vaqueros on the property they are renting from Parks and Recreation. Motion presented by Shannon Laird and Will Rogers (Herigstad). The County is evicting them from their currently used property on Aerie Road which they have used for over 25 years. They are looking at the water district property and the Park and Recreation property on the corner of V.C and Lilac Roads.

Davis: Once this is developed, will other local clubs be able to use it?

A: Parks and Rec will be able to use the property on certain dates. We usually have two events a month (2 - 4 days).

Rudolf: This seems to be premature. Would like to get info from the subcommittee.

Britch: Did you need a major permit at Aerie Park.

A: We did not need one. There was mention of needing one in 1984 but that was it.

Davis: Is Sup. Horn supporting you on this? In the past he has supported us.

Baumgarner: Parks and Rec is in favor of this use. We believe that this is our property and we can do what we want on our property.

Motion: We support the request by the Vaqueros Horse Club to move their current activities to this site. This is a huge benefit to our community.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Hofler/Montross

Carries (Y-N-A): 11- 1-0

Notes:

6.j.

Website Subcommittee

Discussion & Comments: Vote to add Victoria Cloutier as a subcommittee member (Davis)

Motion: to endorse adding Victoria Cloutier as a subcommittee member (Davis)

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	B R I T S C H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L E W I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B A C H M A N
A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y

Maker/Second: Davis/Rudolf

Carries (Y-N-A): 12-0-0

Notes:

7.

Announcements & Items of Interest to the VCCPG: none

8.

Subcommittee Reports & Business:

a)

Mobility – Christine Lewis, Chair.

b)

GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.

c)

Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.

d)

Northern Village – Keith Robertson, Chair.

e)

Parks & Rec. – David Montross, Chair.

f)

Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair. - inactive

g)

Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.

h)

Spanish Valley – Oliver Smith, Chair. - inactive

i)

Tribal Liason – Paul Herigstad, Chair.

j)

Website – Robert Davis, Chair. –

k)

Pauma Ranch – Ann Quinley and Keith Robertson, Chairs. - inactive

l)

Castle Creek – Oliver Smith, Chair. - inactive

m)

Equine Rezoning – Paul Herigstad, Chair.

9.

Correspondence Received:

- County of San Diego, Land Use and Environmental Group to VCCPG; Environmental Assessment for Proposed Trust Acquisition of 9.08 acre fee parcel APN 189-051-02. Seeking to place in trust by the United States of America for San the Pasqual Band of Diegueno Mission Indians. The San Diego Board of Supervisors has stated opposition to taking additional land into trust and has urged the Secretary of the interior to decline to designate as “tribal land” newly purchased land acquired for the purpose of Indian gaming and related uses. The County urges denial of this request. (Project assigned to VCCPG member Paul Herigstad)
- DPLU to VCCPG, Site Plan S06-004; Approve a site plan for a 143 space parking lot with accessory structures for the Valley View Casino on North Lake Wohlford Road. (Project assigned to VCCPG member Paul Herigstad)
- DPLU to VCCPG; APN 189-031-09; Kiva Project 09-0117362; Weekly Second Dwelling Unit Administrative Permit; 300-09-048; located at 31075 Valley Center Road, Valley Center. DPLU has completed the review of the Extended Initial Study/Information and determined it to be incomplete. More information is requested. (DPLU Planner is Dixie Switzer 858-694-3-41) Project assigned to VCCPG member

Chad Christensen.

- d. DPLU to VCCPG; Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Subdivision Ordinance Amendment and Resource Protection Ordinance Amendment with regard to the General Plan Update; Comments on these proposed amendments are requested by June 30, 2010. (DPLU Planner is Carl Stiehl 858-694-2216.) Project assigned to VCCPG member Rich Rudolf
- e. California Equestrian Properties to VCCPG attention Paul Herigstad. Copy of letter to Sally Cobb concerning disclosure of lack of a major use permit on property purchased by Ms. Cobb. Letter assigned to VCCPG member Paul Herigstad.
- f. DPLU to VCCPG; invitation to discuss Alternatives that would reduce the liability of Planning and Sponsor Groups and provide for Community Representation. Discussion will be held on Saturday, June 26, 2010 at 9:00 at DPLU Employee Lunchroom on 5201 Ruffin Road, San Diego. (DPLU planner is Marcus Lubich at 858-694-8847 or marcus.lubich@sdcounty.ca.gov) Letter assigned to VCCPG member Oliver Smith.
- g. G. Department of Public Works to VCCPG; DPW will recommend the County Board of Supervisors authorize asphalt concrete resurfacing of a number of roads in Valley Center. Tentative date of board item is July 14, 2010 at 9:00 am in County Administration Center at 1600 Pacific Highway. (DPW contact is Frank Arebalo at 858 874-4012 or Frank. Arebalo@sdcounty.ca.gov) Letter assigned to VCCPG member Bob Davis.
- h. San Diego Planning Commission to VCCPG; Notice of a Special Meeting about PAA 09-007 (3801 09-007), Saturday, June 12, 2010 from 9:00am to 2:00pm-Tour of Valley Center to include proposed Accretive Site, the Western Cactus Enterprises, the Valley Center Community Center and the site of the Northern Village.
- i. San Diego Planning Commission to VCCPG Notice of Public Hearing June 25.2010 at 9:00 am at 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B. General Amendment to allow consideration of Winery Use Classifications in the (18) Multiple Rural Use and (24) Impact Sensitive Land Use designations of the San Diego General Plan.
- j. DPLU to VCCPG; Lilac Ridge Wireless Telecommunication facility at 10378 Lavender Point Lane in Escondido; 3300-10-010 (P10-010)., Environmental Log No ER10-02-005; DPLU has revised the application submitted for this Major Use Permit and is providing application with information as a guide to further processing of the application. (DPLU Planner is Michelle Chan at 858-694-2610)
- k. LAFCO San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission to VCCPG; Preliminary Staff Report Proposed Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update and Amendments in association with the County Sanitation Services Reorganization. Sanitation services are currently provided in the unincorporated portion of the County by five sanitation districts and four sewer maintenance districts. In February 2010 the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution of application for a reorganization.
- l. DPLU to VCCPG; TM5315RPL6 Tentative Map - Replacement # 3100-5315. APN185-230-91 et al, 11 lot subdivision on 23.16 ac, on Old Castle Rd near Red Mountain Dr., contact Jerry Gaughan, DPLU Planner Kristina Jeffers (858) 694-2604,

10.	Motion to extend the meeting to 10:15 pm	
a)	Maker/Second: Rudolf/Herigstad Vote: 12 – 1 - 0	
11.	Motion to Adjourn: by default	10:15 pm
		Vote:
Notes:		

Appendix A:

To: VCCPG

From: GPU Subcommittee

Re: Recommended Comments on Consistency Zoning

Date: June 28, 2010

Recommendation:

Approve the staff-proposed list of Zoning Recommendations to be consistent with the Revised GPU Land Use Map (Planning Commission Endorsed April 2010), and forward them to Devon Muto ASAP.

Discussion:

See Attachment 1 hereto, 4/28/2010 Devon Muto letter to the Planning Group requesting our comments on staff's proposed Zoning Consistency Review. The GPU Subcommittee (vote: 8-0-0) recommends your approval of all the suggested changes.

PREVIOUS ITEMS:

The staff accepted the VCCPG recommendations on items 1Z (Nelson Way M52 vice M-54), 4Z Dairy

S90 Holding Zone), 6Z (Weston, Alti, and Barry RR to RS), 7Z (Weston and Alti C-34 and RR to RV with B designator for Design Review), 8Z (2 places in North Village and 3 in South Village now General Commercial, from RR or RV to C-36), 9Z (VC View Properties Office Professional from RR to C-30), 10Z (2 parcels south of Cole Grade Road, east of Indian Creek, changed from Industrial to SR-2, outside North Village, from M-54 to RR—see further discussion below), and 11Z (west of VC Road, south of Vesper, now Limited Industrial, change from RR to M-52).

On April 16, 2010 the Planning Commission did not accept our requests for General Plan Land Use designation changes to:

North Village —parcels east of those in item 4, above, to Twain Way (including the expired Chapman PAA), north of Fruitvale, from SR-1 to SR-2;

Outside South Village— parcels south of Betsworth, west of Orchard Run and east of Brook Forest, be reduced from VR-2 and SR-1, to SR-10, SR-2, and SR-0.5 (Area 9U on County’s January Zoning Map, South of Betsworth RL-20); the A-frame and Veterinarian Office on Old Castle from Rural Commercial to Rural residential; nor that Bates Nut Farm be changed from 10 acres of Rural Commercial to Rural Residential; so they are not on this Zoning Consistency Map.

Instead, the Commission approved staff’s recommendation for an additional 7 acres of Rural Commercial at Bates, and staff now recommends a total 20 (13 existing) acres be rezoned from A-70 to C-40 (instead of the S-90 Holding Zone we recommended) (Item 12Z), but the front parcels rezoned from C-40 to A70, consistent with its SR-4 General Plan designation (Item 13Z).

The A-frame and Veterinarian Office on Old Castle was not changed to Rural Residential as we requested, but they are recommending change in the zone from C-40 to C-36, although we asked for C-32 (Item 2Z).

Item 5Z is the old motel complex on VC Road, west of the vacant lot west of the Courtyard complex. Because it is outside the North Village, it is SR-2 on the Environmentally Superior Map, the VCCPG Preferred Alternative map, and was approved by the Planning Commission in April 2010. The VCCPG approved the staff zoning recommendation in March, from C-40 to SR-2. However, staff is now considering a “Residential Commercial Zone” there, which might preserve the existing commercial uses.

NEW ITEMS

Item 3Z is the Anthony Road commercial area, GP designated SR-2, now correcting inconsistency of C-40 zoning to A70. (Staff error in not including in January 8 letter.)

10Z is not “new” (it was part of then-item 5U) and shows as a consistency change from M-54 to RR. There are two or more parcels south of Cole Grade Road, east of Indian Creek, changed from Industrial to SR-2, outside North Village, from M-54 to RR. Two property owners have complained to staff and the VCCPG Chair and GPU subcommittee Chair that they were unaware of the proposed zone change until the county’s April 28 letter. The detail on the Land Use map is not entirely clear, but appears to show those parcels as SR-2, south of the North Village boundary, outside the Industrial area. Staff advises that the parcels are also within the floodway of Moosa Creek. As a countywide policy, the staff is changing all property in floodways to the RR Zone. Staff advises that the General Plan Land Use Designation was changed from Industrial to Residential in 2005 on those properties, and one landowner appealed to the Board of Supervisors and lost. It would be fruitless for the Planning Group to oppose the county position, even if we wanted to. They may make a presentation to the Planning Group tonight.

Items NOT on the Map

Along with some other errors, the PC 4/10 Land Use Map shows the triangular parcel at VC and Canyon Roads (NOT on the proposed Zoning Consistency Map) as Rural Commercial. Although the Planning Group has asked that the error be corrected (because the parcel is too small and outside the Northern Village), staff will not remove that from the PC Map, nor make the companion change in zoning to RR, consistent with the SR-2 designation for the 5Z parcels and those around it, referred to above.

Finally, Carter Harrison, the executor of Ruth parson's estate, brought to staff's and our attention that he was not given notice by the county of the proposed change of zone from C-40 to SR-2 for the parcel east of the VC/Lilac Road intersection (where the former Parson's Realty Office A-frame was). The parcel was General Plan designated Service Commercial, which category has been eliminated since around 2003, It has been shown as Neighborhood Commercial on all the maps since then, but also shown as outside the South Village. The VCCPG asked staff for years to remove it as "spot zoning," and it was finally displayed as SR-2 on the Environmentally Superior Map. It has consistently been outside the South Village (and thus, semi-rural residential) on all the VCCPG Preferred Alternative Maps, and thus on the PC 4/10 Map. Thus the staff's error in failing to notify Mr. Harrison is being corrected, and he will have an opportunity to request reinstatement of Commercial Land Use designation, and zoning, when the matter goes to the Planning Commission on July 9. However, the GPU Subcommittee Chair has advised him his request is not consistent with the long-standing position of the Planning Group, and would not make a recommendation that the Planning Group support his position. However, staff is now also considering a "Residential Commercial Zone" there, which would preserve a commercial use. He may make a presentation to the Planning Group tonight.

CONCLUSION

The objections or concerns discussed above really relate to the changes in General Plan Land Use designation, not its implementing zoning, the subject of staff's Zoning Consistency proposals. Since they are consistent with the recommendations of the VCCPG, the GPU Subcommittee does not recommend support for any of them, as opposed to staff's recommendations.

Minimum Lot Size Changes. The staff's April 28 letter again recommends the same minimum lot sizes as in the January 8 letter (see Table B to Attachment 1). Since we accepted them in March, there is no need to again take action tonight.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Rudolf
Chairperson
GPU Subcommittee

Attachment 1



ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu

April 28, 2010

TO: Valley Center Community Planning Group

FROM: Devon Muto, Chief
Advance Planning, Department of Planning and Land Use

SUBJECT: General Plan Update Zoning Consistency Review

The draft zoning consistency review maps and tables sent to planning and sponsor groups in January have been updated to both incorporate comments received, where applicable, and to recommend any additional zoning changes as a result of recent Planning Commission hearings, when the Planning Commission made final recommendations on the General Plan Update land use map. In addition, **some previously considered zoning changes have been removed to limit the zoning consistency review to only those changes necessary with adoption of the General Plan Update.**

The two enclosed maps indicate proposed zoning and lot size changes based on the land use map endorsed by the Planning Commission on April 16, 2010. The attached tables identify the zoning changes proposed for your community, along with the rationale for these changes similar to what was previously reviewed. This review consists of an analysis of the Zoning Ordinance

zone box including use regulations, density, lot size, building type, and special area regulations for consistency with the General Plan land use map.

The two enclosed maps show preliminary staff-recommended zone box changes (purple hatch) and recommended minimum lot sizes (green hatch). The attached community-specific summary tables correspond with the two maps. Proposed changes shown on the zoning (purple hatch) map are labeled “#Z” to represent a zoning change and items on the lot size (green hatch) map are labeled “#L” to represent the lot size changes.

Although not common, some parcels with existing uses that are legal and are currently in conformance with existing zoning regulations may not be in conformance with some new zoning regulations due to changes being proposed under the General Plan Update. In such cases, the use would be considered legal non-conforming and will continue to be allowed in accordance with the legal non-conforming regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.

Also, please note that as a result of the General Plan Update, density will typically not be part of the development regulations provided in the zone box. Density will be based on the General Plan land use designation in most cases. Therefore as shown in the attached table on proposed zoning changes, a dash “~” is shown in some situations for density. The dash will be revised in the Zoning Ordinance to indicate that density for the subject property is pursuant to General Plan land use designation. Additionally, most residential zones, such as “RS4” with 4 being the number of units per acre, will now be notated as “RS” without the number included.

A Planning Commission hearing to address these proposed zoning changes is tentatively scheduled for July 9, 2010. In order for staff to consider, and incorporate, any additional changes recommended by your planning group prior to this hearing, **comments on this draft review are requested by May 28, 2010.** As always, planning and sponsor group members are invited to meet with General Plan Update staff to review and discuss these documents at our offices. Please send comments or questions you may have to DPLU Planner Carl Stiehl at (858) 694-2216 or by e-mail at Carl.Stiehl@sdcounty.ca.gov.

Attachments

Table A (Zoning)

Table B (Lot Size)

Map A (Proposed Zoning Changes)

Map B (Proposed Lot Size Changes)

DPLU #444 Zoning Ordinance Summary

For additional information regarding zoning use regulations and development regulations, please refer to the reference documents in the 2009 Community Planning and Sponsor Group Training Handbook.

**Valley
Center**

Item	Existing Zoning		Proposed Zoning		Rationale*
1Z	E Use Reg	C40	P Use Reg	M52	M52 is consistent with the Limited or Medium Impact Industrial (I-1 or I-2) designations with corresponding building type
	E Density	~ or .5	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	2ac	
	E Building Type	T or W	P Building Type	W	
	E Special Area Reg	B	P Special Area Reg	B	

2Z	E Use Reg	RR	P Use Reg	C36	C36 is consistent with the Rural Commercial designation, no other changes
	E Density	0.5	P Density	0.5	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	2ac	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	B	P Special Area Reg	B	

3Z	E Use Reg	C40	P Use Reg	A70	A70 is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) designation with corresponding building type
	E Density	~	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	2ac	
	E Building Type	W	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	~	

4Z	E Use Reg	RR	P Use Reg	S90	S90 Holding Area is consistent with Village Core Mixed Use until specific zoning is determined for the area
	E Density	.5 or 1	P Density	Keep Existing	
	E Lot Size	1 or 2ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	B	

5Z	E Use Reg	C40	P Use Reg	RR	RR is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) designation with corresponding building type
	E Density	~	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	6000	P Lot Size	6000	
	E Building Type	W	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	B	P Special Area Reg	~	

6Z	E Use Reg	RR	P Use Reg	RS	RS is consistent with the the
-----------	-----------	----	-----------	----	-------------------------------

					Village Residential (VR-2, VR-2.9 or VR-4.3) designations
	E Density	.5, 1 or 2	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	.5, 1 or 2ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	~	

7Z	E Use Reg	C34 or RR	P Use Reg	RV	RV is consistent with the Village Residential (VR-7.3, VR-10.9 or VR-15) designations with corresponding building type and special reg B for design review
	E Density	2 or 7.3	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	6000 or .5ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C or L	P Building Type	K	
	E Special Area Reg	~ or B	P Special Area Reg	B	

8Z	E Use Reg	RR or RV	P Use Reg	C36	C36 is consistent with the General Commercial with corresponding building type to match adjacent properties and special reg B for design review
	E Density	Various	P Density	Keep Existing	
	E Lot Size	Various	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	L	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	B	

9Z	E Use Reg	RR	P Use Reg	C30	C30 is consistent with the Office Professional with corresponding building type to match adjacent properties and special reg B for design review
	E Density	2	P Density	2	
	E Lot Size	.5ac	P Lot Size	.5ac	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	L	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	B	

10Z	E Use Reg	M54	P Use Reg	RR	RR is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-2) designation with corresponding building type
	E Density	~	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	6000	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	W	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	B, F	P Special Area Reg	F	

11Z	E Use Reg	RR	P Use Reg	M52	M52 is consistent with the Limited Impact Industrial (I-1) designation with special reg B for design review
	E Density	0.5	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	W	
	E Special Area Reg	F	P Special Area Reg	B, F	

12Z	E Use Reg	A70	P Use Reg	C40	C40 is consistent with the Rural Commercial designation with corresponding building type and special reg B for design review
	E Density	0.5	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	C	P Building Type	L	
	E Special Area Reg	~	P Special Area Reg	B	

13Z	E Use Reg	C40	P Use Reg	A70	A70 is consistent with the Semi-Rural Residential (SR-4) designation
	E Density	~	P Density	~	
	E Lot Size	2ac	P Lot Size	Keep Existing	
	E Building Type	W	P Building Type	C	
	E Special Area Reg	B	P Special Area Reg	~	

Table 2

ID	General Location	General Plan Designation*	Existing Minimum Lot Size	Staff Recommended Minimum I
Valley Center				
1L	Intersection of Fruitvale Rd & High Point Dr, and area South of Betsworth Rd.	Semi-Rural 1	2 acre	1 acre
2L	Various	Semi-Rural 2	4, 8, 10 acre	2 acre
3L	North Western Corner of Planning Area	Semi-Rural 4	8 & 10 acre	4 acre
4L	Northern and Southern Village	Village Residential 2	1 & 2 acre	.5 acre
5L	Northern Village	Village Residential 2.9	.5 & 2 acre	15,000 sq ft
6L	Northern and Southern Village	Village Residential 4.3	.5 acre	10,000 sq ft
7L	Northern Village	Village Residential 7.3	.5 & 2 acre	6,000 sq ft
8L	West of Cole Grade Rd	Village Residential 15	.5 acre	6,000 sq ft